Case 2:07-cv-10168-LPZ-RSW

Filed 04/16/2007

Page 1 Dockets.Justia.og

EXHIBIT "A"

remains The action is no longer pending. The docket number and the judge assigned to the action are: Docket no. Judge Barno. VENUE Plaintiff(s) residence (include city, township, or village) Defendant(s) residence (include city, township, or village)

Oakland Place where action arose or business conducted Oakland

Oakland

12/15/06

Signature/of attorney/plaintiff

If you require special accommodations to use the court because of a disability or if you require a foreign language interpreter to help you to fully participate in court proceedings, please contact the court immediately to make arrangements.

MC 01 (3/02) SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT

MCR 2.102(B)(11), MCR 2.104, MCR 2.105, MCR 2.107, MCR 2.119(C)(2)(a),(b), MCR 3.206(A

Page 2 of



STATE OF MICHIGAN

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF OAKLAND

RECTIVED FOR FILING GAKLAND COUNTY CLERK

JULIE ANN ROEHM7 ledividuelle-LPZ-RSW Document 12-3 Filed 04/16/2007

Page 3 of

Plaintiff.

'06 DEC 15 P3:58

No.: 06-

-CK

VS.

Hon.:

WAL-MART STORES, INC., a Delaware Corporation

Defendant.

THE LAW FIRM OF JOHN F. SCHAEFER JOHN F. SCHAEFER (P19948)

B, ANDREW RIFKIN (P46147)

Attorneys for Plaintiff

380 North Old Woodward Suite 320

Birmingham, Michigan 48009

(248) 642-6655

COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

THE LAW FUCM

ohn F. Schaffer

RIBRINGHAM 48) 642-5895 (313) 861-1300 NOW COMES Plaintiff, JULIE ROEHM, by and through her attorneys, THE LAW
FIRM OF JOHN F. SCHAEFER, and for her Complaint against Defendant, WAL-MART
STORES, Chase Ship states onto 6th is Pranciable Countries for the Contract of the Contrac

Page 4

of

Jurisdiction and Parties

- Plaintiff JULIE ANN ROEHM maintains a residence in the City of Rochester Hills, County of Oakland, State of Michigan.
- 2. At all times relevant to this cause, Defendant WAL-MART STORES, INC. was and is a Delaware corporation, directly and or/indirectly (through wholly owned subsidiaries) maintaining retail stores and/or offices in and conducting regular and ongoing business in the County of Oakland, State of Michigan.
- 3. On January 13, 2006, Plaintiff entered into an employment contract with Defendant to employ Plaintiff as a key senior executive of the company, with major responsibilities for marketing, communications, planning, directing, coordinating and controlling overall corporate marketing and media strategy, along with a Post-Termination Agreement and Covenant Not to Compete (all of which are collectively referred to hereinafter as the "Agreement"). (Please see Exhibit A).
- The Agreement was delivered to Plaintiff and executed by Plaintiff in the
 City of Rochester Hills, County of Oakland, State of Michigan.
- The amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional limits of this
 Court.00, excluding interest and costs.

THE LAW FIRM OF OHN F. SCILARIFER PROPERSONAL LIBRES LABORATE

8)84146HAN SHOSSE FORTE (48) 642-6655 (313) 881-1300

Common Allegations

- 6. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates the allegations set forth in paragraphs above as if they were set forth fully, word for word, in this paragraph.
- 7. Caset 2107mes 1001/66t to Ris Complain of the actions of its employees and/or agents, as well as those persons representing themselves to be employees and/or agents of Defendant.

Page 5 of

- 8. As part and parcel of the Agreement, Defendant represented and committed to pay to Plaintiff, in addition to a signing bonus of \$250,000 and her annual base pay of \$325,000, (1) Annual Incentive Payments up to 125% of Plaintiff's annual base salary, based upon Defendant reaching certain pre-established performance measures, (2) a restricted stock award with a value of approximately \$300,000, to be vested over a period from three to five years after the commencement of employment, (3) stock options with a value of approximately \$500,000, to be vested over a period from during the first five years after the commencement of employment, (4) and annual equity awards granted during the first quarter of each year of employment. (Please see Exhibit A).
- 9. The Agreement further provides that Defendant would pay "Relocation" benefits to Plaintiff, including up to 6 mortgage payments, so long as Plaintiff did not voluntarily leave Defendant's employ. (Please see Exhibit A).
- 10. The Agreement also provided that if Defendant "initiates the termination of [Plaintiff's] employment, [Defendant] will, for a period of one (1) year from the effective date of termination ... continue to pay [Plaintiff's] base salary at the rate in effect on the date of termination..." (Please see Exhibit A).

THE LAW FIRM OF OHN P. SCHARFER PROFESSIONAL LINES LAWSETT CONTROL

Based upon and in reliance upon the covenants made by Defendant in the Agreement, Plaintiff temporarily relocated her husband and children from their home in Rochester Hills, Michigan, to a house in Bentonville, Arkansas, and commenced work for Defendant on February 6, 2006. Case 2:07-cv-10168-LPZ-RSW

Document 12-3 Filed 04/16/2007 Page 6 of

- On December 4, 2006, Defendant's CFO told Plaintiff that her employment was being terminated, ostensibly because Plaintiff "hasn't been fulfilling the expectations of an officer of the company."
- Defendant provided no specific examples of any conduct by Plaintiff which 13. did not fulfill the expectations of an officer of the company, because no such conduct exists.
- Despite the fact that no such conduct exists by which Plaintiff did not fulfill 14. the expectations of an officer of the company, Defendant told Plaintiff that her employment was terminated and that she would not receive any further compensation from Defendant beyond December 4, 2006.
- Defendant further holds in its offices personal files and property of Plaintiff, 15. but despite Plaintiff's requests to have that material returned to her, Defendant has refused.
- Thereafter, agents of Defendant made false and malicious statements to 16. the media.

THE LAW BIRM ohn F. Scharder

STRINGS SEROKO KAHDRINGHAN 48) 642-8655 (313) 881-1300

Count I **Breach of Contract**

Plaintiff re-alleges all of the allegations recited in the preceding 17. paragraphs.

- Despite Defendant's contractual obligations both expressed and implied
 Defendant specifically, willfully, and deliberately has breached those obligations.
- 19. By refusing to pay Plaintiff the compensation to which she is entitled pursuant செட்ட Agreement of Agreement of Agreement of Agreement of Agreement of the Agreement with Plaintiff.

Page 7

- 20. By way of example, without limitation, Defendant breached the Agreement by willfully and deliberately refusing pay Plaintiff any of the compensation to which she is entitled pursuant to the Agreement, and as described above.
- 21. By reason of Defendant's breaches of contract, Plaintiff has sustained damages, which include but are not limited to significant economic losses, monetary damages, increased costs, and attorney fees, as well as other consequential losses.
 - Plaintiff has performed all conditions precedent under the Agreement.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this honorable Court grant her judgment against Defendant in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional limits of this Court, plus exemplary and punitive damages, costs, interest, and attorney fees incurred by Plaintiff in the prosecution of this action.

Count II Fraud and Misrepresentation

23. Plaintiff re-alleges all of the allegations recited in the preceding paragraphs.

THE LAW FIRM
OF
OHN F. SCHAEFER
PROTESTINAL MARCH MARINE

BIRMINGHAM GROSSE POINTE 48) 842-6865 (313) 381-1300

- 24. Defendant made material representations of fact to Plaintiff that Defendant would abide in good faith to the terms of the Agreement if Plaintiff entered into the Agreement and relocated her family to Arkansas. Defendant further represented that Defendant, pursuant to the Agreement, would pay all sums due and owing to Plaintiff

 Case 2:07-cv-10168-LPZ-RSW Document 12-3 Filed 04/16/2007 according to the terms of the Agreement.
- Page 8 of
- 25. Defendant's material representations of fact to Plaintiff were false.
- 26. Defendant knew that its representations were false when they were made, or Defendant made the misrepresentations recklessly, without knowledge of their truth as a positive assertion.
- 27. Defendant made these assertions with the intention that the assertions be acted upon by Plaintiff in entering into the Agreement.
- 28. In entering into the Agreement with Defendant, Plaintiff acted in reliance upon the misrepresentations of material fact made by Defendant.
- 29. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's misrepresentations of material facts, Plaintiff has suffered, and will continue to suffer into the future, injuries and damages, including but not limited to significant economic losses, monetary damages, increased costs, attorney fees, as well as other consequential losses.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this honorable Court grant her judgment against Defendant in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional limits of this Court, plus exemplary and punitive damages, costs, interest, and attorney fees incurred by Plaintiff in the prosecution of this action.

THE LAW FROM
OF
HN F. SCHAEFE

OHN F. SCHADFER

148) 642-6635 (312) 881-1300

Count III Claim and Delivery

- 30. Plaintiff re-alleges all of the allegations recited in the preceding paragraphs.
- Case 2:07-cy-10168-LPZ-RSW Document 12-3 Filed 04/16/2007 31. Defendent remains in possession of belongings created and owned 16/2007 entirely by Plaintiff, with no connection whatsoever to Defendant, including but not limited to: (1) her Media Exchange files (which were left in stacks in her office), (2) all materials from all presentations and work she has done prior to her employment with Defendant, and (3) copies of the following computer Outlook folders/files: The Exchange, all personal folders, and Contacts.

Page 9

of

32. Defendant has refused to return those belongings to Plaintiff.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this honorable Court grant her judgment against Defendant, and/or order Defendant to return to Plaintiff forthwith all personal files and property of Plaintiff, and assess against Defendant exemplary and punitive damages, costs, interest, and attorney fees incurred by Plaintiff in the prosecution of this action.

THE LAW FIRM

OHN F. SCHAEFER

BIRKINGHAM GROSS FORTE 48) 642-6895 (313) 881-1390

Respectfully submitted,

THE LAW FIRM OF JOHN F. SCHAEFER

Case 2:07-cv-10168-LPZ-RSW

ent 12-3 / Filed 04/16/2007

Page 10 of

JOHN F. SCHAPFER (P19948) B. ANDREW RIPKIN (P46147)

Attorneys for Plaint#f

380 North Old Woodward Suite 320

Birmingham, MI 48009

(248) 642-6655

Dated: December 15, 2006.

咖袋生

IOHN F. SCHAEFER

8|RM|HGKAH GROSSE +DINTE 148) 642-6955 (3|3) 881-1300

Case 2:07-cv-10168-LPZ-RSW Document 1 Filed 01/10/2007 Page 16 of 20 JUDGE D. LANGFORD MORRIS STATE OF MICHIGAN IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF OAKLAND AFECTVED FOR FILING UAKLAND COUNTY SELEK JULIE ANICROE ANIO Inclivition and LEC 15 P3:58 Filed 04/16/2007 Page 1 Plaintiff, No.: 06--CK Hon.: VS. WAL-MART STORES, INC., a Delaware Corporation Defendant. THE LAW FIRM OF JOHN F. SCHAEFER JOHN F. SCHAEFER (P19948) B. ANDREW RIFKIN (P46147) Attorneys for Plaintiff 380 North Old Woodward Suite 320 Birmingham, Michigan 48009 (248) 642-6655 JURY DEMAND THE LAW PRIM HN F. SCHAEFER GROFFE POINTE 8) 842-8655 (313) 881-1300

of

NOW COMES Plaintiff, JULIE ROEHM, by and through her attorneys, THE LAW FIRM OF JOHN F. SCHAEFER, and hereby demands a trial by jury of the above-entitled cause.

Case 2:07-cv-10168-LPZ-RSW Document 12-3 Filed 04/16/2007

04/16/2007 Page 12 of

Respectfully submitted,

THE LAW FIRM OF JOHN F. SCHAEFER

JOHN F. SCHARFER (P1994)

B. ANDREW RYKIN (P46147)

Attorneys for Plaint#f

380 North Old Woodward Suite 320

Birmingham, MI 48009

(248) 642-6655

Dated: December 15, 2006.

THE LAW FIRM

DIN F. SCHAEFER

HRKINGHAN GROSSE PRINTE 16) 842-8635 (813) 881-1300